REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24 and 25 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 6-21 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,754,885 to Dardinski et al., hereafter Dardinski, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,624 to Hammack et al., hereafter Hammack.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1, 12 and 18 recite a combination of automatically and manually setting version numbers. Neither Dardinski nor Hammack discloses or teaches this combination in a versioning control system. Therefore, the rejection is mistaken as to independent claims 1, 12 and 18.

In particular, independent claim 1 recites "automatically or manually setting a version number of a first object of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level". The phrase "depending on said selected and enabled source control level" qualifies the disjunctive. Thus, a reference or combination of references that teach manual or automatic version numbering, but not both, do not teach the claimed invention. Both Dardinski and Hammack disclose automatic version numbering, but do not disclose manual version numbering. At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Dardinski does not teach the above noted recital but notes that Hammack does, citing column 11, lines 34-44, Figs. 8 and 10, column 12, 1-24, and column 10, lines 15-37.

The column 11 citation deals with user ability to "check-out and check-in items manually utilizing the appropriate command offered by the version sub-menu 120 or the context menu 116", shown in Figs. 6 and 7, respectively. There

is no description in this citation of how Hammack's VCAT system handles versioning. Thus, the column 11 citation does not disclose the step of "automatically or manually setting a version number of a version number of a first one of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level" recited in independent claim 1.

The column 12 citation discloses that "checked-out items may be manually checked-in using the appropriate commands made available in the version control sub-menu 120 and the context menu 116". The citation does not describe how Hammack's VCAT system handles versioning. Thus, the column 11 citation does not disclose the step of "automatically or manually setting a version number of a version number of a first one of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level" recited in independent claim 1.

The column 10 citation describes Figs. 6 and 7, which contain the aforementioned the version sub-menu 120 or the context menu 116. The version control sub-menu 120 contains includes a plurality of task items that may be initiated by a user. These task items include check in, check out, undo check out and others, but do not include any control for "automatically or manually setting a version number of a version number of a first one of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level" recited in independent claim 1.

Fig. 8 shows a version control preferences menu 122 that is reached by selecting "options" in context menu 116 of Fig. 7. A user can use menu 122 to establish user preferences of three different options, namely, "manual or prompt user for check out", "auto check out", and "auto check out and in" (see column 10, lines 39-59). The Examiner contends at pages 2 and 5 of the Office Action that a user "after selecting 'manual check out' in Fig. 8, manually (selects) 'undo check out' in menus 116 or 120 will keep the version number as before check out", citing column 10, lines 15-37. This contention is mistaken. The column 10, lines 15-37, citation supports a selection sequence of check out followed by an

11

undo check out, but does not describe that the version of a checked out item is changed while in a checked out status. In fact, the version number of a checked out item is retained (i.e., is not changed while checked out). It is only upon check in that the version number of a checked out item is changed. Therefore, selection of the "undo check out" command from menu 116 or 120 merely removes the checked out status of the item. There is no description of how user selection of these options is related to "automatically or manually setting a version number of a version number of a first one of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level" recited in independent claim 1.

Fig. 10 and its accompanying description column 14, line 34, to column 15, line 43, shows version identifying information that may be made available to the process designers via a version audit report. Fig. 10 shows an audit report for version numbers 1-8 with the data for each version listing the user, date and time and action taken. There is no description of how user selection of these listings is related to "automatically or manually setting a version number of a version number of a first one of said objects, depending on said selected and enabled source control level" recited in independent claim 1.

The above comments also apply to independent claims 12 and 18, which contain language similar to that of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 1, 12 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2-4, 6-11, 13-17 and 19-21 are unobvious in view of the combination of Dardinski and Hammack.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 22-25 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Dardinski in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0156710 to Cronce, hereafter Cronce, and further in view of Hammack.

This rejection is moot as to claim 23, which has been canceled.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 22, 24 and 25 recite the combination of automatically and manually setting version numbers. As noted above in the discussion of independent claims 1, 12 and 18, neither Dardinski nor Hammack discloses or teaches this combination in a versioning control system. Therefore, the rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

In particular, independent claim 22 recites, "wherein version numbers are set automatically in said control levels of full and basic and manually in said control level of none". Independent claim 24 recites, "wherein version numbers are set manually and automatically in said source control levels of none and basic, respectively". Independent claim 25 recites, "setting a version number for said first object based on a user-enterable number if said full control level is not licensed and if said basic control level is not selected".

As noted above in the discussion of independent claims 1, 12 and 18, neither Dardinski nor Hammack discloses or teaches this combination of automatically and manually setting version numbers in a versioning control system. Cronce merely discloses a licensing method for a software package, but does not disclose or teach the above noted deficiency of the combination of Dardinski and Hammack. Therefore, the combination of Dardinski, Hammack and Cronce does not teach the recited manual and automatic version numbering as recited in independent claims 22, 24 and 25.

Independent claim 22 has also been amended to recite, "setting said control level of support to none as a default". This step was previously recited in canceled claim 23. Neither Cronce, Dardinski nor Hammack discloses or teaches this step.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 1-4, 6-22, 24 and 25 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and passed to issue. If this amendment is deemed to not place the application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2/20/09

Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500